arXiv:1511.03162v1 [math.NT] 10 Nov 2015

Quintic algebras over Dedekind domains and their resolvents

Evan O'Dorney

November 11, 2015

This is an addendum to [4], which classified quadratic, cubic, and quartic rings over a Dedekind domain.

1 A coordinate-free description of resolvents

Let Q be a quintic ring over a Dedekind domain R, and let $L = Q/R$. Our first task is to generalize the notion of a *sextic resolvent,* developed by Bhargava in [2] in the case $R = Z$. Following the approach of [6] and the present author's senior thesis, we expect the resolvent to consist of a rank-5 lattice M (to be thought of as S/R, where S is a sextic ring) with two linear maps relating certain multilinear expressions in L and M. The orientation map θ—which relates the top exterior powers of L and M—is easy to guess. The discriminant of an R-algebra T naturally lies in $(\Lambda^{\text{top}}(T))^{\otimes -2}$. Just as the equality $\operatorname{Disc} Q = \operatorname{Disc} C$ between the discriminants of a quartic ring and its cubic resolvent(s) suggests an identification of the top exterior powers of the two rings, so the relation $\operatorname{Disc} S = (16 \operatorname{Disc} Q)^3$ (Bhargava's (33) of [2]) linking the discriminants of a quintic ring and its sextic resolvent(s) suggests an isomorphism

$$\theta : \Lambda^5 M \to (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}.$$

The second piece of data—that which contains the 40 integers that actually parametrize resolvents over $\mathbb{Z}$—is slightly trickier to work out. Bhargava presents it as a map ϕ from L to $\Lambda^2 M$ (equivalently, from $\Lambda^2 M^*$ to L^*), but this does not have the correct properties in our situation. The correct construction, foreshadowed somewhat by the mysterious constant factor in Bhargava's fundamental resolvent ((28) in [2]), is to take a map

$$\phi : \Lambda^4 L \otimes L \to \Lambda^2 M.$$

Finally, we must find the fundamental relations that link ϕ and θ to the ring structure. Just as Lemma 9 of [1] provided the inspiration for Bhargava's coordinate-free description of resolvents of a quartic ring ([1], section 3.9), so we begin at Lemma 4(a), which, after eliminating the references to S_5-closure, states that

$$\frac{1}{2}\left(\operatorname{Pfaff}\begin{bmatrix}\phi(y) & \phi(x)\\ \phi(x) & \phi(z)\end{bmatrix} - \operatorname{Pfaff}\begin{bmatrix}\phi(y) & \phi(x)\\ \phi(x) & -\phi(z)\end{bmatrix}\right) = 1 \wedge y \wedge x \wedge z \wedge yz.$$

The Pfaffians are to be interpreted by writing $\phi(x)$, etc., as a 5×5 skew-symmetric matrix with regard to any convenient basis (i.e. viewing it as a skew bilinear form on $\Lambda^2 M$, once a generator of $\Lambda^4 L$ is fixed. Then we paste together four of these to make a 10×10 skew-symmetric matrix and take the Pfaffian. This is a clever way to manufacture certain degree-5 integer polynomials in the 40 coefficients of ϕ. To re-express them in a way that is coordinate-free (and applicable in characteristic 2), we consider two preliminary multilinear constructions.

1.1 The quadratic map $\mu \mapsto \mu^\square$

Let V be a 5-dimensional vector space over a field K (which we will soon take to be $\operatorname{Frac} R$). We examine the constructions that can be made starting with elements of $\Lambda^2 V$. We have a bilinear map $\wedge : \Lambda^2 V \times \Lambda^2 V \to \Lambda^4 V$. However, the most fundamental map from $\Lambda^2 V$ to $\Lambda^4 V$ is not the bilinear map $\wedge$ but the quadratic map from which it arises. It is defined by

$$\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} v_i \wedge w_i\right)^\square = \sum_{1 \le i < j \le n} v_i \wedge w_i \wedge v_j \wedge w_j. \tag{1}$$

It is not hard to prove that this is well defined. Note that if $\operatorname{char} K \neq 2$, then $\mu^\square$ can be described more simply by

$$\mu^\square = \frac{1}{2}\mu \wedge \mu.$$

Moreover, the bilinear map $\wedge$ can always be recovered from $\bullet^\square$ via

$$\mu \wedge \nu = (\mu + \nu)^\square - \mu^\square - \nu^\square. \tag{2}$$

1.2 The contraction $\mu(\alpha, \beta)$

The second construction takes one element $\mu \in \Lambda^2 V$ and two elements $\alpha, \beta \in \Lambda^4 V$ and outputs an element of a suitable one-dimensional vector space as follows. First, the perfect pairing

$$\wedge : \Lambda^4 V \times V \to \Lambda^5 V$$

allows us to identify α and β as elements of $\Lambda^5 V \otimes V^*$. These have a wedge product

$$\alpha \wedge \beta \in \Lambda^2(\Lambda^5 V \otimes V^*) \cong (\Lambda^5 V)^{\otimes 2} \otimes \Lambda^2 V^*.$$

We now use the duality between $\Lambda^2 V^*$ and $\Lambda^2 V$, described explicitly by

$$(f \wedge g)(v \wedge w) = fv \cdot gw - fw \cdot gv,$$

to obtain an element

$$\mu(\alpha, \beta) \in (\Lambda^5 V)^{\otimes 2}.$$

1.3 The definition

We are now ready to state the definition of a sextic resolvent.

Definition 1.1. Let Q be a quintic ring over a Dedekind domain R, and let $L = Q/R$. A *resolvent* for Q consists of a rank-5 lattice M and a pair of linear maps

$$\phi : \Lambda^4 L \otimes L \to \Lambda^2 M \quad \text{and} \quad \theta : \Lambda^5 M \to (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}$$

satisfying the identity

$$\theta^{\otimes 2}[\phi(\lambda_1 x)(\phi(\lambda_2 y)^\square, \phi(\lambda_3 z)^\square] = \lambda_1 \lambda_2^2 \lambda_3^2 (x \wedge y \wedge z \wedge yz) \tag{3}$$

where $x, y, z \in L$ and $\lambda_i \in \Lambda^4 L$ are formal variables. The resolvent is called *numerical* if θ is an isomorphism.

Note that the expression within square brackets lies in $(\Lambda^5 M)^{\otimes 2}$; applying $\theta^{\otimes 2}$, one ends up in $(\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 6}$ which is where the right-hand side also resides. It should also be remarked that the product yz is carried out in Q; translating the lifts $\tilde{y}, \tilde{z}$ by constants in R simply changes the product $\tilde{y}\tilde{z}$ by multiples of $\tilde{y}$, $\tilde{z}$, and 1, thereby not changing the product $y \wedge z \wedge yz$.

2 Resolvent to ring

Our first task is to show that the resolvent maps ϕ and θ uniquely encode the multiplication data of the ring Q.

Theorem 2.1. *Let L and M be lattices over R of ranks 4 and 5 respectively, and let $\phi : \Lambda^4 L \otimes L \to \Lambda^2 M$ and $\theta : \Lambda^5 M \to (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}$ be maps. There is a quintic ring Q with a quotient map $Q/R \cong L$, unique up to isomorphism, such that (M, ϕ, θ) is a resolvent of Q.*

Proof. Let (e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4) be a basis for L, by which we mean that there is a decomposition $L = \mathfrak{a}_1 e_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus \mathfrak{a}_4 e_4$ for some fractional ideals $\mathfrak{a}_i$ of R. To place a ring structure on the module $Q = L \oplus R$, it is then necessary to choose the coefficient $c_{ij}^k \in \mathfrak{a}_k \mathfrak{a}_i^{-1} \mathfrak{a}_j^{-1}$ of e_k in the product $e_i e_j$. We allow $k = 0$, with the conventions $e_0 = 1$ and $\mathfrak{a}_0 = R$. On the other hand, allowing $i = 0$ or $j = 0$ gives no useful information. Hence the ring structure is given by the 40 coefficients c_{ij}^k, $1 \le i \le j \le 4$, $0 \le k \le 5$.

Some of these coefficients are immediately determined by the resolvent. For instance, if $\{i, j, k, \ell\}$ is a permutation of $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$, and $\epsilon = \pm 1$ its sign, then

$$c_{ij}^k = -\epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-1} \cdot e_\ell \wedge e_i \wedge e_j \wedge e_i e_j = -\epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-6} \cdot \theta^{\otimes 2}[\phi(e_\ell e_{\text{top}})(\phi^\square(e_i e_{\text{top}}), \phi^\square(e_j e_{\text{top}})], \tag{4}$$

where $e_{\text{top}} = e_1 \wedge e_2 \wedge e_3 \wedge e_4 = \epsilon \cdot e_i \wedge e_j \wedge e_k \wedge e_\ell$ is the natural generator of $\Lambda^4 L$. This determines the values of all c_{ij}^k where i, j, and k are nonzero and distinct.

Likewise, the following expressions are determined, for i, j, k distinct:

$$\begin{aligned} c_{ii}^j &= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-1} \cdot e_\ell \wedge e_i \wedge (e_i + e_k) \wedge e_i(e_i + e_k) - c_{ik}^j \\ c_{ik}^k - c_{ij}^j &= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-1} \cdot e_\ell \wedge e_i \wedge (e_j + e_k) \wedge e_i(e_j + e_k) - c_{ik}^j + c_{ij}^k \\ c_{ii}^i - c_{ij}^j - c_{ik}^k &= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-1} \cdot e_\ell \wedge (e_i + e_k) \wedge (e_i + e_j) \wedge (e_i + e_j)(e_i + e_k) \\ &\quad - c_{jk}^i + c_{ik}^j + c_{ij}^k + c_{ii}^j + c_{ii}^k + (c_{kj}^j - c_{ki}^i) + (c_{jk}^k - c_{ji}^i). \end{aligned} \tag{5}$$

The reader familiar with ring parametrizations will recognize the left-hand sides of (4) and (5) as the linear expressions in the c_{ij}^k that are invariant under translations $e_i \mapsto e_i + t_i$ ($t_i \in \mathfrak{a}_i^{-1}$) of the ring basis elements. If we normalize our basis so that, say, $c_{12}^1 = c_{12}^2 = c_{34}^3 = c_{34}^4 = 0$, then all the c_{ij}^k are now uniquely determined, except for the c_{ij}^0. The c_{ij}^0 can be computed by comparing the coefficients of k in $(e_i e_j)e_k$ and $e_i(e_j e_k)$ for any $k \neq i$, yielding formula (22) of [2]:

$$c_{ij}^0 = \sum_{r=1}^{4} (c_{jk}^r c_{ri}^k - c_{ij}^r c_{rk}^k).$$

The theorem is now reduced to three verifications.

1. That all c_{ij}^k belong to the correct ideals $\mathfrak{a}_k \mathfrak{a}_i^{-1} \mathfrak{a}_j^{-1}$. This is routine.

2. That the c_{ij}^0 are well defined, and more generally that the associative law holds on the ring $Q = \sum \mathfrak{a}_i e_i$ that we have just constructed. This is a family of integer polynomial identities in the 40 free coefficients of ϕ in the chosen basis; as such, it was proved in the course of Bhargava's parametrization of quintic rings over $\mathbb{Z}$.

3. That the original maps ϕ and θ indeed form a resolvent of Q, i.e. that the identity (3) holds. This can probably also be proved by appeal to results over $\mathbb{Z}$, but here a direct proof is not difficult. We can assume that $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = e_{\text{top}}$ and x is a basis element e_ℓ, since the equation (3) is linear in those variables. We can also assume that each of y and z is a basis element or a sum of two different basis elements, since (3) is quadratic in those variables. Now we have a finite set of cases, some of which are the relations (4) and (5), and the rest of which will be reduced to them using the following properties of the underlying multilinear operations:

Lemma 2.2. *Let V be a 5-dimensional vector space, and let $\mu, \nu, \xi \in \Lambda^2 V$ and $\alpha \in \Lambda^4 V$. Then*

(a) $\mu(\mu \wedge \nu, \alpha) = \nu(\mu^\square, \alpha)$
(b) $\mu(\mu^\square, \alpha) = 0$
(c) $\nu(\mu^\square, \mu \wedge \xi) = -\xi(\mu^\square, \mu \wedge \nu)$.

Proof. Calculation, although only (a) need be checked directly, as (b) follows by setting $\mu = \nu$ and (c) by the derivation

$$\nu(\mu^\square, \mu \wedge \xi) = \mu(\mu \wedge \nu, \mu \wedge \xi) = -\mu(\mu \wedge \xi, \mu \wedge \nu) = -\xi(\mu^\square, \mu \wedge \nu).$$

■

Now we return to proving

$$\theta^{\otimes 2}[\phi(e_{\text{top}}x)(\phi(e_{\text{top}}y)^\square, \phi(e_{\text{top}}z)^\square] = e_{\text{top}}^5(e_\ell \wedge y \wedge z \wedge yz) \tag{6}$$

for $x = e_\ell$ and $y, z \in \{e_i\}_i \cup \{e_i + e_j\}_{i<j}$. The cases where e_ℓ does not appear in y or z are all subsumed by the definitions (4) and (5), with one exception: the expression for c_{ii}^j is not visibly symmetric under switching k and ℓ. This can be seen by writing

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{ii}^j &= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-1}(e_\ell \wedge e_i \wedge (e_i + e_k) \wedge e_i(e_i + e_k) - e_\ell \wedge e_i \wedge e_k \wedge e_i e_k) \\
&= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-5}\big(\phi(e_\ell)(\phi^\square(e_i), \phi^\square(e_i + e_k)) - \phi(e_\ell)(\phi^\square(e_i), \phi^\square(e_k))\big) \\
&= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-5}\big(\phi(e_\ell)(\phi^\square(e_i), \phi^\square(e_i) + \phi(e_i) \wedge \phi(e_k) + \phi^\square(e_k)) - \phi(e_\ell)(\phi^\square(e_i), \phi^\square(e_k))\big) \\
&= \epsilon e_{\text{top}}^{-5}\big(\phi(e_\ell)(\phi^\square(e_i), \phi(e_i) \wedge \phi(e_k))\big)
\end{aligned}$$

and using Lemma 2.2(c). It remains to dispose of the cases where e_ℓ does appear in y or z. The key is to use Lemma 2.2(a) to reduce the case $(x, x + y, z)$ of (6) to the cases (x, y, z) and (y, x, z). The details are left to the reader. ■

Remark. Over $\mathbb{Z}$, assuming that θ is an isomorphism, the resolvent devolves into the basis representation of ϕ. This has 40 independent entries which can be arranged into a quadruple of 5×5 skew-symmetric matrices, representing the values $\phi(x)$ (as x runs through a basis) as skew bilinear forms on M^*. The coefficients c_{ij}^k of the ring we have constructed are certain degree-5 polynomials in these 40 entries which are easily identified with the formulas given in (21) of [2]. Thus our definition of resolvent is compatible with Bhargava's (Definition 10), which justifies our invocation of his computations in our situation, despite the dissimilarities of the definitions.

2.1 The sextic ring

It ought to be remarked that, given any resolvent (L, M, ϕ, θ), the rank-6 lattice $M \oplus R$ also picks up a canonical ring structure, whose structure coefficients d_{ij}^k are integer polynomials in the coefficients of ϕ of degree 12 (for $k \neq 0$) and 24 (for $k = 0$). As the construction given by Bhargava in [2], Section 6 works without change over a Dedekind domain, we will not discuss it further.

3 Constructing resolvents

3.1 Resolvents over a field

Let K be a field. We will first investigate what sort of family of resolvents a quintic K-algebra has. In the quartic case, it was the *trivial ring* $T = K[x, y, z]/(x, y, z)^2$ that had a large family, all

other rings having a unique resolvent. Here, if a ring has multiple resolvents, it is not necessarily trivial, but as we will see, it is in a sense minimally far from being trivial. The appropriate definition is as follows:

Definition 3.1. A quintic algebra Q over K is *very degenerate* if it has subspaces $Q_4 \subseteq Q_3$, of dimension 4 and 3 respectively, such that $Q_4 Q_3 = 0$ (that is, the product of any element of Q_4 and any element of Q_3 is zero).

This implies that Q has a multiplication table

$\times$	1	α	β	γ	δ
1	1	α	β	γ	δ
α	α	u	0	0	0
β	β	0	0	0	0
γ	γ	0	0	0	0
δ	δ	0	0	0	0

(7)

in which 15 of the 16 non-forced entries are zero. We prove:

Theorem 3.2. *Every not very degenerate quintic K-algebra has a unique resolvent up to isomorphism.*

Proof. The first few steps are easy: let M be a K-vector space of dimension 5, and let $\theta : \Lambda^5 M \to (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}$ be any isomorphism. So far we have not made any choices. (The choice $\theta = 0$ works only for the trivial ring.) We will first try to construct the map $\phi^\square = \phi(\bullet)^\square$, a quadratic map from $\Lambda^4 L \otimes L$ to $\Lambda^4 M$. For this purpose we concoct a corollary of (3) that involves only $\phi^\square$.

Lemma 3.3. *Let V be a 5-dimensional vector space. Let $\mu \in \Lambda^2 M$ and $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta \in \Lambda^4 M$. Then*

$$\mu^\square \wedge \alpha \wedge \beta \wedge \gamma \wedge \delta = \mu(\alpha, \beta)\mu(\gamma, \delta) + \mu(\alpha, \gamma)\mu(\delta, \beta) + \mu(\alpha, \delta)\mu(\beta, \gamma)$$

in $\Lambda^5(\Lambda^4 V) \cong (\Lambda^5 V)^{\otimes 4}$.

Proof. Write the general μ as $u \wedge v + w \wedge x$ $(u, v, w, x \in V)$ and expand. ∎

As a corollary, we get that if (M, ϕ, θ) is a resolvent of a quintic ring Q, then for all $a, b, c, d, e \in \Lambda^4 L \otimes L$,

Motivated by this, we define for any quintic ring Q the pentaquadratic form

$$\begin{aligned} F(a,b,c,d,e) = {} & (a \wedge b \wedge c \wedge bc)(a \wedge d \wedge e \wedge de) \\ & + (a \wedge b \wedge d \wedge bd)(a \wedge e \wedge c \wedge ec) + (a \wedge b \wedge e \wedge be)(a \wedge c \wedge d \wedge cd) \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

from L^5 to $(\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 2}$, or equivalently from $(\Lambda^4 L \otimes L)^5$ to $(\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 12}$. We get that for any resolvent (M, ϕ, θ) of Q,

$$\theta^{\otimes 4}(\phi^\square(a) \wedge \phi^\square(b) \wedge \phi^\square(c) \wedge \phi^\square(d) \wedge \phi^\square(e)) = F(a, b, c, d, e). \tag{9}$$

We claim the following:

Lemma 3.4. *F is identically zero if and only if Q is very degenerate.*

Proof. We prove that the property of being very degenerate is invariant under base-changing to the algebraic closure $\bar{K}$ of K; then the lemma can be proved by checking the finitely many quintic algebras over an algebraically closed field (see [3, 5]). Let $\bar{Q} = Q \otimes_K \bar{K}$ be the corresponding

$\bar{K}$-algebra. Clearly if Q is very degenerate, so is $\bar{Q}$, so assume that $\bar{Q}$ is very degenerate. Then the subsets

$$M = \{x \in Q' | \dim \ker x \geq 3\} \quad \text{and} \quad N = \{x \in Q' | Mx = 0\}$$

are, by reference to the multiplication table (7), vector spaces with $\dim M = 4$ and $\dim N \in \{3, 4\}$. Moreover, because they are canonically defined, they are invariant under the Galois group $\mathrm{Gal}(\bar{K}/K)$. This shows that $M \cap Q$ and $N \cap Q$ are K-vector spaces of the same dimensions with $(M \cap Q)(N \cap Q) = 0$, so Q is very degenerate. ■

Picking $a_1, \ldots, a_5 \in \Lambda^4 L \otimes L$ such that $F(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5) = f_0 \neq 0$, we get that the five vectors $v_i = \phi^{\square}(a_i)$ must form a basis such that

$$\theta^{\otimes 4}(v_1 \wedge v_2 \wedge v_3 \wedge v_4 \wedge v_5) = f_0.$$

Any such basis is as good as any other—they are all related by elements of $\mathrm{SL}(\wedge^4 M)$, which is canonically isomorphic to $\mathrm{SL}(M)$ (although $\mathrm{GL}(\wedge^4 M) \ncong \mathrm{GL}(M)$ in general). Once the v_i are fixed, there is at most one candidate for the map $\phi^{\square}$ up to $\mathrm{SL}(M)$-equivalence, namely

$$\phi^{\square}(a) = \sum_{i=1}^{5} \frac{F(a_1, \ldots, \hat{a_i}, a, \ldots, a_5)}{F(a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4, a_5)} v_i \tag{10}$$

Then the relations

$$\phi(x)(\phi^{\square}(a_i), \phi^{\square}(a_j)) = x \wedge a_i \wedge a_j \wedge a_i a_j,$$

for $1 \leq i < j \leq 5$, determine the map ϕ uniquely. So the resolvent map ϕ, if it exists, must be given by a predetermined formula, or rather by any one of a finite number of such formulas, inasmuch as the a_i in (10) can be chosen from the finite set $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_1 + e_2, e_1 + e_3, \ldots, e_3 + e_4\}$ for any basis $\{e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4\}$ of $\Lambda^4 L \otimes L$. It remains to prove that the (M, ϕ, θ) we have hereby constructed is actually a resolvent; this is a collection of integer polynomial identities, not in a family of free variables as in the previous lemma, but in the coefficients c_{ij}^k of the given ring Q, which are restricted by the associative law. If Q has nonzero discriminant—the most common case—the theorem can be proved by base-changing to the algebraic closure $\bar{K}$ and noting that $\bar{K}^{\oplus 5}$, the unique nondegenerate quintic $\bar{K}$-algebra, *does* have a resolvent (Example 4.1). The general case can be handled by a limiting argument, appealing to the known fact that all quintic $\bar{K}$-algebras can be deformed to $\bar{K}^{\oplus 5}$, at least in characteristic zero (see [3]). ■

3.2 From field to Dedekind domain

Let Q be a quintic ring over a Dedekind domain R. We will assume that Q is not very degenerate and hence that the corresponding K-algebra $Q_K = Q \otimes_R K$ has a unique resolvent (M_K, ϕ, θ). Resolvents of Q are now in bijection with lattices M in the vector space M_K such that

$$\phi(\Lambda^4 L \otimes L) \subseteq \Lambda^2 M \tag{11}$$

$$\theta(\Lambda^5 M) \subseteq (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}. \tag{12}$$

For any resolvent M, note that we must have

$$M^* \cong \Lambda^4 M \otimes (M^5)^{\otimes -1} \supseteq \phi^{\square}(\Lambda^4 L \otimes L) \otimes (\theta((\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}))^{\otimes -1}.$$

Since Q is not very degenerate, the right-hand side is a lattice of full rank and we may take its dual, which we denote by M_0. Then any resolvent is contained in M_0. Condition (11) is vacuous for $M = M_0$, since

$$\phi(\lambda x)(\phi^{\square}(\lambda' y), \phi^{\square}(\lambda'' z)) = \theta^{\otimes 2}(\lambda \lambda' \lambda''(x \wedge y \wedge z \wedge yz)) \in (\theta(\Lambda^3 L))^{\otimes 2}$$

for all $\lambda', \lambda'' \in \Lambda^3 L$ and $y, z \in L$. On the other hand, condition (12) is generally not satisfied by $M = M_0$; indeed, one readily finds that $\theta^{-1}((\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}) \subseteq \Lambda^5 M_0$ using (9), so if M_0 is a resolvent, it is numerical.

The classification of resolvents is now reduced to a local problem. Any M determines a family of resolvents $(M_\mathfrak{p}, \phi, \theta)$ of the quintic algebras $Q_\mathfrak{p}$ over the DVR's $R_\mathfrak{p} \subseteq K$, and conversely an arbitrary choice of resolvents $M_\mathfrak{p}$ of the $R_\mathfrak{p}$ can be glued together to form the resolvent $M = \bigcap_\mathfrak{p} M_\mathfrak{p}$. The choice $M_\mathfrak{p} = M_{0,\mathfrak{p}} = M_0 \otimes R_\mathfrak{p}$ is forced for all but finitely many primes $\mathfrak{p}$, namely those dividing the ideal

$$\mathfrak{c} = [\Lambda^5 M_0 : \theta^{-1}((\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3})] = [(\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 2} : \langle F(a,b,c,d,e) : a,b,c,d,e \in L \rangle]. \tag{13}$$

In the lucky case that $\mathfrak{c}$ is the unit ideal, M_0 is the only resolvent. This occurs in one important instance:

Theorem 3.5. *If Q is a* maximal *quintic ring, that is, is not contained in any strictly larger quintic ring, then Q has a unique resolvent, which is numerical.*

Proof. Suppose that $\mathfrak{c}$ were not the unit ideal, so there is a prime $\mathfrak{p}$ such that $\mathfrak{p} | F(a,b,c,d,e)$ for all $a, b, c, d, e \in L$. We will prove that Q is not maximal at $\mathfrak{p}$. It is convenient to localize and to assume that $R = R_\mathfrak{p}$ is a DVR with uniformizer π.

Note that $Q/\mathfrak{p}Q$, a quintic algebra over $R/\mathfrak{p}$, has its associated pentaquadratic form F identically zero, so by Lemma 3.4, it is very degenerate. So Q has an R-basis $(1, x, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)$ such that $(x, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3)(\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3) \subseteq \mathfrak{p}R$. We claim that the lattice Q' with basis $(1, x, \pi^{-1}\epsilon_1, \pi^{-1}\epsilon_2, \pi^{-1}\epsilon_3$ either is a quintic ring or is contained in a quintic ring, showing that Q is not maximal.

Set $M = \langle \pi, x, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \rangle$ and $N = \langle \pi, \pi x, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \rangle$. Then $Q \supseteq M \supseteq N \supseteq \pi Q$ and $MN \subseteq \pi Q$. Consider, for any $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, the multiplication maps

$$\begin{array}{ccccccc} Q/N & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_i} & N/\pi Q & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_j} & \pi Q/\pi N & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_i} & \pi N/\pi^2 Q \\ \| & & \| & & \| & & \| \\ \langle 1, x \rangle & & \langle \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \rangle & & \langle \pi, \pi x \rangle & & \langle \pi\epsilon_1, \pi\epsilon_2, \pi\epsilon_3 \rangle . \end{array}$$

These are all linear maps of $R/\mathfrak{p}$-vector spaces. Denote by f the composition of the left two maps and by g the composition of the right two. Write $f(1) = \pi(a + bx)$, where $a, b \in R/\mathfrak{p}$. Then $g(\epsilon_i) = a\pi\epsilon_i$, since $x\epsilon_i \in \pi Q$. Thus g is given in the bases above by the scalar matrix a. But g has rank at most 2, since it factors through the two-dimensional space $\pi Q/\pi N$; hence $a = 0$. So $N^2 \subseteq \pi M$.

Now consider the following multiplication maps:

$$\begin{array}{ccccccccc} Q/M & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_i} & N/\pi Q & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_j} & \pi M/\pi N & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_k} & \pi^2 Q/\pi^2 M & \xrightarrow{\epsilon_i} & \pi^2 N/\pi^3 Q \\ \| & & \| & & \| & & \| & & \| \\ \langle 1 \rangle & & \langle \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3 \rangle & & \langle \pi x \rangle & & \left\langle \pi^2 \right\rangle & & \left\langle \pi^2\epsilon_1, \pi^2\epsilon_2, \pi^2\epsilon_3 \right\rangle . \end{array}$$

Similarly to the previous argument, the composition of the first three maps must be zero, or else the composition of the last three would be a nonzero scalar. Since the images of the first map (as i varies) span $N/\pi Q$, the composition of the middle two maps is always zero. There are two cases:

(a) The second map is always zero, that is, $N^2 \subseteq \pi N$. This implies that $\pi^{-1}N$ is a quintic ring, as desired.

(b) The third map is always zero, that is, $MN \subseteq \pi M$. We get that $\pi^{-1}\epsilon_i$ is integral over R (look at the characteristic polynomial of its action on M), so $R[\pi^{-1}\epsilon_1, \pi^{-1}\epsilon_2, \pi^{-1}\epsilon_3]$ is finitely generated and thus a quintic ring, as desired.

■

Note that, in this proof, if the resolvent is not unique, then the extension $Q' \supsetneq Q$ has $(R/\mathfrak{p})^3 \subseteq Q'/Q$. So the following stronger theorem holds:

Theorem 3.6. *If Q is a quintic ring such that the $R/\mathfrak{p}$-vector space of congruence classes in $\pi^{-1}Q/Q$ whose elements are integral over R has dimension at most 2, for each prime $\mathfrak{p}$, then Q has a unique resolvent, which is numerical.*

3.3 Bounds on the number of numerical resolvents

Finally, we examine bounds on the number of numerical resolvents a not very degenerate quintic ring can have. A lower bound of 1 was proved over $\mathbb{Z}$ in [2], Theorem 12; the method is adaptable to our situation, and we do not attempt to sharpen the bound. Instead, let us prove a complementary upper bound in terms of the invariant $\mathfrak{c}$ of (13).

Theorem 3.7. *A not very degenerate ring Q has at most*

$$\prod_{\substack{\mathfrak{p} \text{ prime,} \\ \mathfrak{p}^n \| \mathfrak{c}}} \left(\frac{N(\mathfrak{p})^5 - 1}{N(\mathfrak{p}) - 1} \right)^n$$

numerical resolvents, provided that the absolute norms $N(\mathfrak{p}) = |R/\mathfrak{p}|$ are finite. In particular, a not very degenerate quintic ring over the ring of integers of a number field has finitely many numerical resolvents.

Proof. Since all numerical resolvents have index $\mathfrak{c}$ in M_0, it suffices to bound the number of sublattices of index $\mathfrak{c}$ in a fixed lattice M_0. By localization we may reduce to the case $\mathfrak{c} = \mathfrak{p}^n$, where $\mathfrak{p}$ is prime. Now a fixed lattice M has $(N(\mathfrak{p})^5 - 1)/(N(\mathfrak{p}) - 1)$ sublattices of index $\mathfrak{p}$, the kernels of the nonzero linear functionals $\ell : M/\mathfrak{p}M \to R/\mathfrak{p}$ mod scaling. A sublattice M_n of index $\mathfrak{p}^n$ has a filtration $M_0 \subsetneq M_1 \subsetneq \cdots \subsetneq M_n$ where the quotients are $R/\mathfrak{p}$; given M_i, there are at most $(N(\mathfrak{p})^5 - 1)/(N(\mathfrak{p}) - 1)$ possibilities for M_{i+1}, giving the claimed bound. ■

4 Examples

Example 4.1. The most fundamental example of a sextic resolvent is as follows. Let $Q = R^{\oplus 5}$, with basis $e_1, e_2, \ldots, e_5$, and let $M = R^5$ with basis $f_1, \ldots, f_5$. Then the map

$$\phi(e_i) = f_i \wedge (f_{i-1} + f_{i+1})$$

(indices mod 5), supplemented by the natural orientation $\theta(f_{\text{top}}) = e_{\text{top}}^3$, is verified to be a resolvent for Q (indeed the unique one, as Q is maximal). The automorphism group S_5 of Q acts on M by the 5-dimensional irreducible representation obtained (in characteristic not 2) by restricting to the image of the exceptional embedding $S_5 \hookrightarrow S_6$ the standard representation of S_6, permuting the six vectors

$$f_{i-2} - f_{i-1} + f_i - f_{i+1} + f_{i+2} \quad (1 \le i \le 5) \quad \text{and} \quad f_1 + f_2 + f_3 + f_4 + f_5.$$

Example 4.2. For the subring

$$Q = \{x_1e_1 + \cdots + x_5e_5 \in \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 5} : x_1 \equiv x_2 \equiv x_3 \equiv x_4 \bmod p\},$$

the bounding module M_0 of Section 3.2 is no longer a resolvent, as can be seen by observing that $Q/pQ \cong \mathbb{F}_p[t, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \epsilon_3]/\langle\{t^2 - t, t\epsilon_i, \epsilon_i\epsilon_j\}\rangle$ is very degenerate. We have $L = \langle pe_1, pe_2, pe_3, e_5\rangle$ and thus $\Lambda^4 L = \langle p^3 e_{\text{top}}\rangle$. One computes that

$$M_0 = \left\langle p(f_1 + f_4), p^2f_2, p^2f_3, p^2f_4, pf_5\right\rangle,$$

and thus

$$\mathfrak{c} = [\Lambda^5 M_0 : \theta^{-1}((\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3})] = [\langle p^8 f_{\text{top}}\rangle : \langle p^9 f_{\text{top}}\rangle] = p.$$

Consequently a numerical resolvent of Q is a submodule M of index p in M_0 having the property that $\phi(\Lambda^4 L \otimes L) \subseteq \Lambda^2 M$. Writing M as the kernel of some linear functional $\ell : M_0/pM_0 \to \mathbb{F}_p$, the condition is that ℓ lies in the kernel of each of the skew-symmetric bilinear forms obtained by reducing $\phi(x) \in \Lambda^2 M_0 \bmod p$ for all $x \in \Lambda^4 L \otimes L$). Let

$$f_1' = p(f_1 + f_4), f_2' = p^2f_2, f_3' = p^2f_3, f_4' = p^2f_4, f_5' = pf_5$$

be the basis elements of M_0 listed above. We compute

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi(p^4 e_{\text{top}}e_1) &= (pf_1' - f_4') \wedge (pf_5' + f_2')\\
\phi(p^4 e_{\text{top}}e_2) &= f_2' \wedge (pf_1' - f_4' + f_3')\\
\phi(p^4 e_{\text{top}}e_3) &= f_3' \wedge (pf_2' + f_4')\\
\phi(p^3 e_{\text{top}}e_5) &= f_5' \wedge (pf_1').
\end{aligned}$$

So, letting $\bar{f}_i'$ denote the basis vector of M_0/pM_0 corresponding to f_i' and $\bar{f}_i'^*$ the corresponding vector of the dual basis, we have

$$\ell \in \ker(\bar{f}_2' \wedge \bar{f}_4') \cap \ker(\bar{f}_2' \wedge \bar{f}_3') \cap \ker(\bar{f}_3' \wedge \bar{f}_4') = \left\langle \bar{f}_1'^*, \bar{f}_5'^*\right\rangle.$$

Since ℓ can take any value in the last-named vector space, up to scaling, we get $p + 1$ numerical resolvents (and, as it turns out, no nonnumerical ones).

Example 4.3. The ring

$$Q = \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[x, y]/(x, y)^2$$

is a curious example of Theorem 3.6. Although Q is infinitely far from being maximal ($\mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z} \oplus \mathbb{Z}[n^{-1}x, n^{-1}y]/(n^{-2}(x, y)^2)$ is a quintic extension ring for any $n > 0$), the extensions are only in two directions, as it were, and the resolvent is accordingly unique.

Example 4.4. The simplest example of a *non-numerical resolvent* is given by the ring

$$Q = \mathbb{Z} + p^2\mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 5} = \{x_1e_1 + \cdots + x_5e_5 \in \mathbb{Z}^{\oplus 5} : x_1 \equiv \cdots \equiv x_5 \bmod p^2\}.$$

We recognize $L = p^2L_1$, and we set $M = p^5M_1$, $\phi = \phi_1|_{\Lambda^4 L\otimes L}$, and $\theta = \theta_1|_M$, where the subscript 1 denotes the corresponding entity in Example 4.1. Here

$$\phi(\Lambda^4 L \otimes L) = \phi(p^8\Lambda^4 L_1 \otimes p^2 L_1) = p^{10}\Lambda^2 M_1 = \Lambda^2 M,$$

while

$$\theta(\Lambda^5 M) = \theta(p^{25}\Lambda^5 M_1) = p^{25}(\Lambda^4 L_1)^{\otimes 3} \subsetneq p^{24}(\Lambda^4 L_1)^{\otimes 3} = (p^8\Lambda^4 L_1)^{\otimes 3} = (\Lambda^4 L)^{\otimes 3}.$$

The ring Q also has a large number of *numerical* resolvents, including for instance any supermodule of index p over M.

Example 4.5. *Very degenerate rings.* Over a field K, a very degenerate ring has a multiplication table (7) with a single indeterminate entry $u = \alpha^2$. By changing basis, we can reduce to the case that u is either α, β, or 0, giving three very degenerate rings up to isomorphism; in Mazzola's nomenclature [3], they are

$$\begin{aligned} A_{18} &= K \oplus K[x,y,z]/(x,y,z)^2, \\ A_{19} &= K[x,y,z]/(x^3, xy, y^2, xz, yz, z^2) \\ A_{20} &= K[x,y,z,w]/(x,y,z,w)^4. \end{aligned}$$

Each of these has a large family of resolvents. Utilizing Bhargava's representation of ϕ as a quadruple of 5×5 skew-symmetric matrices, the maps

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&1*&*&*&-1&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&1&0&*\\0&-1&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&0&-1&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\1&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&1&0&0&*\\-1&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

(where $*$ represents any element) are resolvents for A_{18}, while

$$\left(\begin{bmatrix} 0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&1&0&*\\0&-1&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&1*&*&*&-1&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&0&-1&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\1&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix}, \begin{bmatrix} 0&1&0&0&*\\-1&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&*\\0&0&0&0&0*&*&*&0&0 \end{bmatrix} \right)$$

works for A_{19}. The trivial ring A_{20} has an even larger family of resolvents, namely those where ϕ lands in $\Lambda^2 N$, for any hyperplane $N \subseteq M$, or in $V \wedge M$ for any 2-plane V, or where $\theta = 0$. Are these *all* the resolvents? The classification of resolvents of very degenerate rings, even over fields, is an inviting problem which does not readily yield to the $\phi^{\square}$-based method of Theorem 3.2.

References

[1] Manjul Bhargava. Higher composition laws. III. The parametrization of quartic rings. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 159(3):1329–1360, 2004.

[2] Manjul Bhargava. Higher composition laws. IV. The parametrization of quintic rings. *Ann. of Math. (2)*, 167(1):53–94, 2008.

[3] Guerino Mazzola. Generic finite schemes and Hochschild cocycles. *Comment. Math. Helv.*, 55(2):267–293, 1980.

[4] Evan O'Dorney. Rings of small rank over a Dedekind domain. `http://arxiv.org/abs/1508.02777` (accessed 11/10/2015). Awaiting publication.

[5] Bjorn Poonen. The moduli space of commutative algebras of finite rank. *J. Eur. Math. Soc. (JEMS)*, 10(3):817–836, 2008.

[6] Melanie Matchett Wood. Parametrizing quartic algebras over an arbitrary base. *Algebra Number Theory*, 5(8):1069–1094, 2011.